

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET				
SUBJECT: (Optional)				
FROM: <input type="text"/> Director of Information Services 1205 Ames Bldg		EXTENSION	NO. 015 85-154	STAT
			DATE 5 April 1985	STAT
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

Attached is a copy of Garfinkel's response to the letter from Sen. Leahy.

Attachments:
Letters

DA:D/OIS

Distribution:
 2 - DDA
 1 - D/OLL
 1 - C/OGC/LD
 1 - C/IMS/DO
 1 - OIS Chrono
 1 - OIS SUBJECT
 LEGAL - Classified
 Info in Personal Files
 of Senators

STAT

STAT

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Director of Information Services
1205 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

OIS 85-154

STAT

DATE

5 April 1985

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. D/OLL
7D43 HDQS.

Chuck:

Attached is a copy of
Garfinkel's response to the
letter from Sen. Leahy.

You might want to send
Gary Chase a copy. Also, do
we leave hanging the DCI's
unanswered letter? For one,
I'm prepared to stand at ease.

STAT

Attachments:
Letters

DAVE DURENBERGER, MINNESOTA, CHAIRMAN
PATRICK LEAHY, VERMONT, VICE CHAIRMAN

WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., DELAWARE
WILLIAM S. COHEN, MAINE
ORRIN MATCH, UTAH
FRANK MURKOWSKI, ALASKA
ARLEN SPECTER, PENNSYLVANIA
CHIC HECHT, NEVADA
BUTCH MCCONNELL, KENTUCKY

LLOYD BENTSEN, TEXAS
SAM NUN, GEORGIA
THOMAS F. SAGLITON, MISSOURI
BRIELET F. HOLLINGS, SOUTH CAROLINA
BILL BRADLEY, NEW JERSEY
DAVID L. BORER, OREGON

ROBERT BOLE, KANSAS, EX OFFICIO
ROBERT C. BYRD, WEST VIRGINIA, EX OFFICIO

United States Senate

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

85-1016

March 14, 1985

Mr. Steven Garfinkel
Director
Information Security Oversight Office
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

To	Rec'd	Due
Z	3/25	4/3
Coord with		
Sign		
A		
Info to		
A, EG		

Dear Mr. Garfinkel:

Mrs. Bethine Church, the widow of Senator Frank Church, has referred to me your correspondence of last September with Mr. Timothy A. Brown, the University Librarian of Boise State University. You requested access to the papers of Senator Church for Executive branch officials, in order to determine if the collection contains any classified information.

Prior to my becoming Vice Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Committee staff were also referred a note from [redacted] Director of Information Services of the Central Intelligence Agency. According to this note, it was actually officials of the CIA who contacted you to request this action, although these officials professed that other federal agencies also might have "equities" in the information contained in the papers.

As you know, the President has asserted the privilege, in Executive Order No. 12356 on National Security Information (paragraph 1.6(c)), to "reclassify" information already released, provided the information "may reasonably be recovered." On March 10, 1982, this Committee recommended to you that ISOO's Implementing Directive under the Executive Order should provide for "limitation of reclassification ... ordinarily to cases of mistaken disclosure of information that is voluntarily returned, with exceptions only for the gravest danger to national security." In response to questions by Members of the Committee, including Senator Durenberger and myself, dated February 26, 1982, you committed your Office to "recommend inclusion of language in the ... Implementing Directive which will ordinarily limit the applicability of this provision to situations in which the information can be retrieved voluntarily."

STAT

085-0949

MAR 25 1985

Mr. Steven Garfinkel
March 14, 1985
Page 2

Even if Senator Church had been an official in the Executive branch, the current circumstances would, I believe, be inappropriate for the Administration to seek such review of his papers. My staff has examined about thirty pages of written contents to the numerous boxes of records included in the Frank Church collection. There is no indication in these lists of contents, aside from the barest of entries concerning "the CIA," "Vietnam," "foreign policy," or the like, that there is any significant probability that the relevant records might contain classified information. Indeed, for the most part such entries appear to refer to such inherently unclassified material as public statements, press clippings, and constituent correspondence.

Furthermore, the University Librarian, in his letter of reply to you, indicated that spot checks had been run on the collection, as well as partial reviews in preparation for allowing researchers to use the collection. The Librarian and his staff found no classified documents during these reviews. Furthermore, the Librarian has indicated that he will (as any professional librarian would do as a matter of course) see to it that any materials to be made available to researchers are thoroughly reviewed by Library staff first; the Library staff will be alerted to the need to protect classified material.

Further, as you are no doubt aware, the deed of gift from Senator Church dated March 7, 1984 requires the Librarian to limit access to papers in the collection in accordance with "the procedures established by law or executive order governing the availability of such information." There is every indication that the University Librarian intends to take these responsibilities seriously.

Numerous government officials, from the lowest to the highest, who have had access to classified material, including intelligence information, have left public life without having their papers reviewed for the presence of classified information. Indeed, in well-known cases, senior Executive branch officials have left government service taking their "personal" files with them -- without any review even at the time of separation. I am nevertheless not aware of any other case in which the Administration has proposed to review the papers of a former public figure for classified material.

Mr. Steven Garfinkel
March 14, 1985
Page 3

Frank Church was, furthermore, a United States Senator. The Senate, through its Standing Rules and the rules of its Committees, has an independent right to determine the classification of national security information, including intelligence information. The Senate Office of Classified National Security Information was established in part for this purpose. The Select Committee on Intelligence, which succeeded Senator Church's investigative committee and holds its papers, is entitled under Senate Resolution No. 400 (1976) to make independent decision concerning release of classified information including intelligence information, subject to final determination by the Senate in case of Presidential appeal from the Committee's decision.

It should also be realized that the Senate committees with which Frank Church worked have their own security systems which provide for careful document control. I am personally familiar with the procedures employed by the Select Committee on Intelligence, which were originally developed by the investigative committee chaired by Senator Church. These procedures provide for centralized control of classified documents and do not permit storage of classified material in the Members' offices. (The Select Committee on Intelligence in fact holds a large volume of files from Church Committee days.) His colleagues, congressional staff and others who knew Senator Church indicate that he was extremely conscientious in these matters and did not retain classified information in his Senate office. While Chairman of his investigative committee, he was furthermore advised on these matters by a full-time Security Director and other security staff.

For the reasons above, I believe it would be inappropriate to have Executive branch personnel review the papers of Frank Church. The papers of this great United States Senator and great American should not be subjected to such an extraordinary procedure, which to my knowledge has never been applied to another figure of equal stature in our public life. I hope, therefore, that you will advise relevant Executive branch officials that you recommend against taking any further action on their request that these documents be opened for their review.

Sincerely,



PATRICK LEAHY
Vice Chairman